

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project



### Public Open Houses – October 2002 Public Comment Summary

Open houses were held during October 2002 to update the public on the progress of the SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project and to provide an opportunity for comment. Over 300 people attended the open houses, which were advertised corridor-wide. Display advertisements were placed in the following newspapers: Seattle Times; Seattle PI; Eastside Journal; Redmond Reporter; University Herald. Newsletters advertising the open houses were sent to the project mailing list and an e-mail announcement went out those on the electronic distribution list, for a total of 7,652 names. Sixty-five posters were sent to community facilities on both the east and west sides of the corridor to advertise the open houses. In addition, the open houses were advertised at the October 10<sup>th</sup> University of Washington Transportation Fair and at October community briefings, including, Montlake Community Club and Norwegian Commercial Club.

The open houses were designed to bring the public up to speed on the Trans-Lake project, familiarizing them with the Preliminary Preferred Alternative and what would be built during first phase construction. Display boards were staffed by project team members and arranged based on the following topics:

- 4- 6- and 8-lane alternatives
- 6-lanes, as the preliminary preferred alternative
- First phase build options
- Environmental review process
- Community issues

Attendees were encouraged to ask questions and give feedback on the issues by talking with members of the project team or writing comments on a flip chart. They were also invited to fill out comment forms and leave them at the event or mail them in.

A majority of the comments were made in response to questions on the comment forms. Major themes from comments made at these open houses include:

#### **Eastside Open House, Medina Elementary School, Medina, WA – October 21, 2002**

Twenty-one comments were submitted at the eastside open house. The verbatim comments are attached to this summary. The following is a summary of the comments received:

- Many people agreed with the 8-lane alternative and thought that it was the best option, while several people commented that the 6-lane option was preferable.
- Several commenters said that the lids would be beneficial to their communities; a few thought that the proposed lids were too short.

## **SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project**

- A few people commented that the increased noise that the project would bring to the Points communities would negatively impact those neighborhoods. They would like to see the noise impacts mitigated.

### **Westside Open House, Museum of History and Industry, Seattle, WA – October 28, 2002**

Thirty nine comments were submitted at the westside open house. The verbatim comments are attached to this summary. The following summarizes the comments received:

- Several people objected to the 8-lane alternative and thought that it was a waste of time to continue studying that plan.
- Many commenters expressed their dissatisfaction with the environmental review process.
- People stated their support for the preliminary preferred (6-lane) plan, while several others approved of the 4-lane option.
- Many people commented that phase I would result in heavier traffic and congestion in the Montlake area.
- Several people expressed their enthusiasm for the bike exit to Madison Park.
- Many people said that they would like to see more transit options and less of an emphasis on SOVs.
- A few people commented on the need for noise mitigation in the Montlake neighborhood.

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

### Eastside Open House, Medina Elementary School, Medina, WA – October 21, 2002

#	Comments
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. 6 lane just doesn't meet the goal of the study</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. -</li></ol>
2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. –</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. Thanks for having this open house</li></ol>
3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. Strongly support the 8-lane alternative – the others will be a poor utilization of transportation infrastructure investment due to the very low increase in overall mobility while the 8-lane will do the most to improve mobility for <u>all</u> users.</li><li>3. 4-lane &amp; 6-lane – high cost long delays poor results. 8-lane – high cost, long delays, best results.</li><li>4. We have skirted our responsibility to accommodate our mobility needs for 30 + years. It is time to do <u>everything</u> we can to catch up. This means as many GP lanes as possible while making it as nice (low-impact) as possible, but always remember – Form Follows Function and the function of our highway system is to move people in vehicles and goods.</li></ol>
4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. Want only the 6-lane alternative with future expansion for mass transit alternatives. We cannot build more SOV capacity. The alternatives of HOV must become more attractive.</li><li>3. Expansion further would eliminate more houses, create more noise and more pollution. All are negative impacts.</li><li>4. Want Evergreen Point Rd. to remain at the current elevation.</li></ol>
5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Good process</li><li>2. I prefer the 6-lane alternative. Be sure to have a shoulder for breakdowns.</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. Good plan for the future</li></ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seattle is noisy. Japanese Garden is a good example.</li> <li>2. Herz Ni Tamip [sic] (Synagogue) on I-90 and E Mera is quiet but is on I-90 [gentleman was referring to a synagogue on a lid over I-90]</li> <li>3. Ivars's deck is noisy on the deck outside but quiet inside</li> <li>4. -</li> </ol>
7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. SR 520 Bridge not in WSDOT's top 10 bridge priority for replacement.</li> </ol>
8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Previous discarded studies should not be used to “zero in” on the present 520 corridor as the only one under consideration</li> <li>2. These alternatives do not include a 6 lane crossing elsewhere. To increase capacity 20,000 cars per day is not viable. Value Engineering would likely recommend keeping SR 520 as is with retrofits (80,000/day) and building a new crossing (100,000 cars/day) for a total of 180,000/day. Why would anyone take on this project to end up with only 20,000 more than existing?</li> <li>3. Community impact will be irreversible through Montlake @ Shelby Hamlin Montlake and I-5</li> <li>4. Please mail me one copy of: “ACCOMMODATING HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT IN THE SR 520 CORRIDOR” August 23, 2002 by WSDOT. 401 2 Ave So. 98104</li> </ol>
9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It has been good</li> <li>2. 6-lane alt is best; put HOV lanes on inside. The trail concept is good.</li> <li>3. I live Clyde Hill; don't think adverse impacts are significant. Lids good (+); trail beneficial</li> <li>4. The Phase I approach looks good (Bell Wy to Montlake) – realistic regarding avail \$ Is 92<sup>nd</sup> flyer stop really needed? Wouldn't a flyer stop @ Bell Way be more desirable? The noise impact exhibits were arcane/poor – could be simplified There is no existing trail on N-side E/O 92<sup>nd</sup> (exhibit is wrong)</li> </ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This has been going on too long – the review is too arbitrary to accomplish anything. All it has done is a way of delay a soliciting votes for democrats [sic]. They use them to pay off campaign dollars.</li><li>2. Why not plan for the future put 8 lanes in now so that light rail, bus, or whatever, they can accommodate it. We all know that the main purpose is to get people out of their cars + into buses – acknowledge they are not and serve the people not the politicians.</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. When this state starts to audit the transportation dept. I will agree to vote for some of its recommendations as it is now you can bet that it will go way over budget + <u>no one</u> will say where the money went. This state is crooked to believe anything they say unless it is we want more taxes – make this R 51 accountable to someone outside of the WSDOT.</li></ol>
11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. It's taking much longer than I-405's The goal of reducing congestion, improving mobility and doing it at the least cost per passenger trip must be the paramount criteria</li><li>2. 8 lanes (or 6 general purpose) would offer the best results. The pre-preliminary preferred alternative is unacceptable! No new lanes for cars is irresponsible.</li><li>3. The 8 lane alternative would help eliminate cut-through traffic The improved mobility would increase my quality of life Our economy would benefit if 8 lanes are built</li><li>4. The 8-lane alternative is the only one that meets the letter and intent of SB 6140. The RTID funding will be jeopardized if no new general purpose capacity is planned or built.</li></ol>
12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. Strongly recommend minimum of 6 lanes with additional capacity provisions (e.g. HCT as additional) if we are going to have HCT across the lake do it with new build (i.e. on 520) – leave I-90 alone. It works well as it is. We will probably be sorry we did not plan for 8 lanes, one day.</li><li>3. HCT on I-90 would have a strong adverse effect. I-90's capacity is best used in current format</li><li>4. -</li></ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A costly farce of course the environment is going to be altered.</li> <li>2. A costly farce. Boeing has already gone, we have no money, Eastern Washington hates Seattle, Seattle hates Bellevue + so it goes.</li> <li>3. More and more traffic congestion as Seattle comes to work on the Eastside.</li> <li>4. Build a 3<sup>rd</sup> bridge from Kirkland to Sand Point to I-5. Cover the Seattle side because they always fuss so much. Look @ a map!! A straight shot makes more sense than the meandering cow path that is SR 520 now. Plus we need local participation + problem solving DOT represents the whole state. We need to address our problems here in Bellevue. Sound Transit swallows all the \$ with their silly streetcars. The Feds do just fine. I-90 is workable...but I doubt the Feds will want to sink any more \$ money into a bridge just 5 miles N. of I-90. And finally there is no more money. Never has been. Never will be. Parks are closing. Clinics are closing. And again...we could have built a 3<sup>rd</sup> bridge with what we pay all these designers + consultants + enviro studies.</li> </ol>
14	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Process seems to be quite thorough.</li> <li>2. Small lid at 92<sup>nd</sup></li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. New bridge Juanita to Seattle would probably eliminate need for 520 expansion</li> </ol>
15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. The LID at 84<sup>th</sup> 250' (short lid) is a joke! What kind of community connection does this provide. The park at Hunts Point has an on-ramp between the proposed short lid and the park. Extend the lid all the way to 92<sup>nd</sup> and build ball fields.</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. -</li> </ol>
16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I hope you will select a 6 lane crossing with raised lanes on the west access over Foster Island extending on to Montlake. I hope you will protect the wetlands for our future generations.</li> <li>2. I hope you will consult with the Arboretum to develop use of the land located on the west approach. I also hope you won't build north of the existing 520 in the Montlake area. I'd hate to see the Landmark Seattle Yacht Club built right next to.</li> <li>3. Noise is a factor to be examined. I am not opposed to having the bridge closed during some of the construction. We've managed before recently when we had to close Alaska Way we managed.</li> <li>4. -</li> </ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
17	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It takes too long – too many people &amp; agencies involved – it should focus on how to do transportation projects in an environmentally sensitive manner instead of why not to do it.</li> <li>2. The preliminary preferred alternative of 6 lanes does little to reduce congestion. The 520 corridor needs a minimum of 8 lanes (4 GP or 3 GP and 1 HOV each way) to have any noticeable impact on reducing congestion and meeting the demand.</li> <li>3. Building 8 lanes reduces N/S traffic on I-405 &amp; I-5 and I-90 traffic across Mercer Island.</li> <li>4. Anything less than 8 lanes is not cost-effective and questionable whether it would meet the funding requirements of SB 6140 which is aimed at increasing GP capacity and reducing congestion. The preliminary preferred alternative jeopardizes the project and makes it more vulnerable to court challenge.</li> </ol>
18	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. The 520 bridge project is not listed in the top 10 (WSDOT) list for replacement. Why is so much planning &amp; design work going on?</li> </ol>
19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It appears to be geared to “squeaky wheel” responses rather than getting all of those affected to weighing alternatives.</li> <li>2. Putting the bike trail on the south side through Clyde Hill is absurdly costly. A total waste if the “Points” people want it, let them pay the added costs!</li> <li>3. Increased traffic [illegible] noise all will be [illegible]. The 8-lane alternative is the best answer.</li> <li>4. Obviously, not everyone can be appeased. I firmly believe that paying with tolls is mandatory. It certainly worked well the first time around.</li> </ol>
20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Being from the arboretum – large impact on the environment on the north part of the arboretum. Less impact on Foster Island the better.</li> <li>2. Do not feel 8 lane is appropriate.</li> <li>3. Noise – bad [illegible] larger imprint on the arboretum</li> <li>4. Look forward to your presentation at the Nov. Board Mtg.</li> </ol>
21	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. I’m happy to see that the highway will stay mainly in the present right of way. I am concerned that the lids will not do much for those who live near the highway. I hope there will be adequate park and rides.</li> </ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

Westside Open House, Museum of History and Industry, Seattle, WA – October 28, 2002

#	Comments
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. –</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. Bike/ped shown on wrong side of bridge.</li></ol>
2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. –</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. Need a direct connection from EB/WB 520 to Pacific, eliminate LW Blvd on-ramp.</li></ol>
3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. 8-lane – NO!</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. –</li></ol>
4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Keep Aubrey Davis on Mercer Island where he should stay and remain silent – Have a leader without a conflict of interest. Don't railroad the 520 like the last meeting showed with Aubrey falling asleep at the wheel.</li><li>2. –</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. –</li></ol>
5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Enough graphs – enough “consultants”. Play it straight with us.</li><li>2. Why is this Eastside vs. Westside? Why is it not the best for the region – our neighborhood has been ripped apart. Why 6-lanes? Keep 4 and make an HOV – in one lane each way – The Eastside won't get out of their cars or carpool.</li><li>3. Terribly – more noise, more pollution – the decimation of a neighborhood that was already stripped in the early 60's – Just be <u>honest</u> and let us know – that everything will be gone –</li><li>4. All of us who have appealed our RIE taxes the last 2 years have won! One of the big factors is NOISE – the traffic in our “Roanoke Park” neighborhood with over 100 kids under 16 – is terrible – I-5, 520, helicopters, Roanoke interchange – we are not a thoroughfare – we are a neighborhood</li></ol>



## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. The proposed phase I worsens congestion on Montlake Blvd. This is an unacceptable impact for the neighborhood and the city. When you consider the dollar cost, construction impacts, ongoing environmental impacts and additional congestion caused by adding HOV lanes, the benefits are not worth this. I am skeptical that a second bascule bridge would solve or even significantly improve the congestion on Montlake Blvd.</li> <li>3. 1) More congestion in the neighborhood, 2) More noise for all but a few whom noise walls can help, 3) Decreased property values, 4) Construction impacts, 5) Loss of habitat, open space, parkland.</li> <li>4. I strongly approve of the bicycle connection to Madison Park. This would represent a major improvement in the region-wide bicycle network. In light of what we now know, the project should consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Phase I: Rebuild 4-lane floating bridge and approaches – <u>widen-able</u> to 6-lanes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement congestion pricing</li> <li>Retrofit Portage Bay viaduct if feasible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>-Phase II: Construct HCT between UW and Bellevue or bored bus tunnel from North Link station at Rainier Vista to dedicated transit lanes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide for efficient transfer to North Link. By the time capacity is reached, we can further improve the HCT network.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The argument that we shouldn't build HCT because it will be too popular is crazy.</p> </li> </ol>
7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. Lengthening lid to eliminate the eyesore of the noise wall would make your proposal far more appealing. You could create a park which would be something positive for people to view instead of a view blocking wall.</li> <li>3. Widening of 520 would have a negative impact on Montlake by attracting more vehicle trips per day through the neighborhood.</li> <li>4. when you make a presentation – please supply a translation for all of your abbreviations. Thanks.</li> </ol>
8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. Document request: Portage Bay Alignment west end (I-5 to Montlake)</li> </ol>
9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. The I-90 tunnel through Mt. Baker was built and works – why not tunnel for 520 under I-5 and eliminate those vehicles from I-5, form a more destination orientation, extend the life of I-5 and allow 8-lanes for 520.</li> </ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to determine effect on Montlake Neighborhood streets <u>and</u> I-5 <u>and</u> Seattle generally.</li> <li>More lanes = more cars. Where is incentive for HOV or <u>real</u> transit?</li> <li>More traffic does not equal greater livability or safety.</li> <li>–</li> </ol>
11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>–</li> <li>The 520 bridge is now “gridlocked” and construction of additional lanes will make it worse during the time of construction.</li> <li>Disruptive.</li> <li>Why not passenger ferries to cross Lake Washington to relieve vehicular congestion as are now being operated to cross Puget Sound with park ride lots built on each side of the lake.</li> </ol>
12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>–</li> <li>Bad Bad Bad. Montlake Boulevard need pedestrian overpass at UW hospital.</li> <li>–</li> <li>–</li> </ol>
13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It seems thoughtful and responsive to date. Please keep it that way!</li> <li>I am in favor of minimal expansion and increased development of effective mass transit so that impacts of roadway expansion is minimal.</li> <li>I work for the Arboretum and as an employee, neighbor, and citizen am concerned about this projects impact on the Arboretum – I also live on Portage Bay – so am concerned about increased expansion and how that is handled.</li> <li>I have concerns for noise in the area of the Arboretum and the range between Montlake and I-5.</li> </ol>
14	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>–</li> <li>Increase length of lid east from Montlake Boulevard to existing pedestrian/bike overpass, or beyond, to proposed bike pedestrian underpass. This would increase noise mitigation and public open space. It would have less impact on Lake Washington Boulevard residents than a sound barrier wall.</li> <li>Increased traffic volume on Montlake Boulevard <u>due</u> to Alternative 1 is a concern.</li> <li>Need plans of Phase I construction plans only showed alternative 1 at completion. How much time between Phase I and construction and completion of all construction on alternative1?</li> </ol>
15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>–</li> <li>We need HCT U-District to Bellevue in this project now!</li> <li>–</li> <li>–</li> </ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. For Phase I – there must be equity in lidding amenities between Seattle and Clyde Hill/Yarrow Point regardless of whether road construction occurs in Seattle in Phase I.</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. –</li> </ol>
17	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A sham.</li> <li>2. All bad. Leave it the way it is. Replace the bridge if you must. Get people out of their cars. Don't widen the footprint through Montlake. Lid the freeway through Montlake.</li> <li>3. Adversely. I may have to move.</li> <li>4. Vote against R-51. This entire process is sick and wrong!</li> </ol>
18	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. Give us all alternatives that Translake has considered not just SR 520 widening – the value engineering may be better served and serve more by other locations. Of course we need some [illegible] on 520.</li> </ol>
19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I am concerned about the air and soil quality in the homes between Hamlin to the exit ramp. I wouldn't want my children playing in a backyard contaminated by car exhaust!</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. I am happy with many of the proposals – lid, sound wall, two on ramp lanes to 520 from Montlake, the trees remaining on Montlake south of the Montlake Bridge – in the median. Thank you for all your hard work. Mary Freiburger</li> </ol>
20	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Studying the 8-lane option is a complete waste of money if money is tight for the 6-lane option, common sense indicates that we will never get funding for the 8-lane option.</li> <li>2. Go as cheap as possible → 4-lanes. City arterials can't take more. If we do "phase I", than "phase 2" will never happen → look at the history of publicly funded projects.</li> <li>3. No benefit, just pain. It seems to benefit the Eastside only.</li> <li>4. Hopefully, R-51 will be defeated, and then policy makers will listen to the constituency before drafting a replacement referendum.</li> </ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
21	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. HOV, bikes, busses -- yes Cars – no</li> </ol>
22	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scott Rutherford sez: “bet on “Do Nothing” – you won’t lose.”</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. --</li> </ol>
23	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Corridor planning for Portage Bay – I-5. Section must be committed to in phase I – not changed later.</li> <li>2. Noise walls design must be shown for 6 and 8-lane with section sketches.</li> <li>3. 8-lane is a disaster to my Portage Bay neighborhood. 6-lane needs more design facility sketch and impact analysis</li> <li>4. Portage Bay viaduct is seismically unstable why is it not being included in phase I?</li> </ol>
24	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. The preliminary proposed alternative (adding one HOV lane in each direction) is an indictment of all involved in selecting it. This “improvement” was first endorsed in 1974, twenty-eight years ago. How can various committees, staff and Trans-lake process facilitators take any pride (much less paychecks) for producing an abysmally myopic “solution”? It is disgusting to think of the time, energy and money wasted over the past several years.</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. --</li> </ol>
25	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A sham – not really listening to Montlake</li> <li>2. Should stick w/ 6-lanes within right of way → see '95 Brinkerhoff study. No expansion to 8 lanes – encourage mass transit.</li> <li>3. Negative property values, destroys houses, only moves mess Medina to Montlake, overwhelming construction, little benefit</li> <li>4. We could vote on mass transit, light rail. It would probably pass today.</li> </ol>
26	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not enough “run off” in city proper for more POV’s</li> <li>2. Mass Transit – copy San Francisco</li> <li>3. Lower pollution – air and noise</li> <li>4. --</li> </ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
27	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It's awful that we're still wasting my time and money on an 8-lane alternative that is <u>clearly</u> not a possibility.</li> <li>2. I only like 4 lanes, possibly with Train/HCT in extra 2 lanes.</li> <li>3. Will make Seattle uglier – more pavement, giant bridge over the water, more congestion, more noise.</li> <li>4. It pains me to see how the arteries (e.g. Montlake Blvd.) just get more clogged – this is a hwy solution – but the big picture gets worse for Seattle. We need to get people out of SUVs and focus on the # of people served – not vehicles. I'd prefer sticking with 4 lanes, aggressive HOV/Transit push, preserve our parks and Seattle neighborhoods, and save money to do train over 520 that can help pull people out of cars because it's a <u>significant</u> travel improvement worth a transfer.</li> </ol>
28	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Very thorough in terms of public presentations</li> <li>2. Look good in construction w/ flyover tunnel – but I strongly object to 8-lane option. While I am somewhat willing to accept the 6-lane alternative, I still have grave concerns about the number and width of shoulders proposed – what is to prevent these from being restriped into an 8-lane configuration (a la I-90)??</li> <li>3. Obviously, more traffic into Montlake, my neighborhood, as capacity is not increased there. Why not decrease shoulder/buffer widths and include tunnel from 520 to U.W. in 6-lane alternative.</li> <li>4. Clarify how much freeway will be raised (w/ or w/out tunnel). Bike exit at Madison Park a wonderful proposal!! I am not in favor of option const. Alt. 2 (Figure 6) – bike/ped lane on bridge (don't we already have that?). Don't favor option M (2<sup>nd</sup> vehicular bridge across cut w/ additional HOV lanes)</li> </ol>
29	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There have been significant changes in the proposals. Especially in the last six months. While we attend as many of these meetings as possible, it is not possible to often have a voice heard.</li> <li>2. The phase I proposals will <u>all</u> increase traffic in the Montlake Blvd. Area to a further unacceptable level. This has always been a problem, but the suggestion of a second Montlake bridge is an environmentally and historically focused solution that should not be allowed.</li> <li>3. Congestion in Montlake will be the direct result of dumping more traffic in the Montlake Blvd. Corridor. The demolition of houses, the incursion of the roadway into residential neighborhoods and the destruction of a historically important Montlake Bridge should not be allowed in the EIS or in discussion for phase I.</li> <li>4. The Montlake Bridge has been a historic structure in our community, city and state. Its architecturally pleasing features have been the focus of artists, historic publications, magazines and newscasts. The alteration of this structure by the proposed addition of a second bridge to parallel it will totally corrupt this protected structure. The proposal of such as crossing and the demolition of family dwellings in the process should not continue to be an option of these planning documents!</li> </ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. Alternatives were not clearly presented! No consideration of depressed / lidded / R/W in Montlake area. No sound control provision for developing east of Foster Island. No provisions for mass transit shown.</li> <li>3. How are roadway run-offs to be controlled and treated? No consideration is being given to the impacts of NSW construction to produce no increase from present level.</li> <li>4. Exit for 520 westbound traffic insufficient to handle anticipated flow of traffic .</li> </ol>
31	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. Is possible that the HOV lanes may be used as general purpose during non-peak periods?</li> <li>3. So far, I am not too impacted, however I do recognize the need for something to be done.</li> <li>4. The Corsica Analysis was a useful visual aid!</li> </ol>
32	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. Unless you plan a tunnel to take the N-bound traffic <u>under</u> the ship canal (instead of over Montlake Bridge) you are merely creating congestion problems – not solving them! Think 50 years ahead, not just 10 years! Swiss engineers can show you how to build tunnels.</li> </ol>
33	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do not hear how WSDOT is approaching environmental impacts on wetlands and lake. General impression is that this project is “bigger than” our environmental laws.</li> <li>2. –</li> <li>3. Madison Park does not want a bike ramp cutting through the wetlands onto 37<sup>th</sup>. This has already been rejected by the City due to environmental impact.</li> <li>4. –</li> </ol>
34	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. –</li> <li>2. Do <u>not</u> reserve 70’ of R.O.W. through Montlake for a stupid location of a “flyer” stop. Put a transit stop closer to the University Hospital where people want to go and create new bus routes from/to there across 520. Do NOT wait for Sound Transit and/ or Metro to “decide” on a link station that might cal for relocating the flyer stop. With or without light rail, it makes enormous sense to relocate the flyer stop (including especially adhering the “minimum footprint” goal of Seattle neighborhoods).</li> <li>3. –</li> <li>4. --</li> </ol>

## SR 520 Trans-Lake Washington Project

#	Comments
35	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. –</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. Phase I noise mitigation appears to leave a “hole” in the noise walls at 24<sup>th</sup> Ave E crossing (a.k.a. Park Drive). Phase I HOV lanes create a new “weave” on 520 w/ bus carpool lanes of traffic.</li></ol>
36	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Bike accessibility of very important to me. Please seriously consider the Madison Park access.</li><li>2. –</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. I would be most excited about some type of Mass Transit light rail, monorail going across the bridge.</li></ol>
37	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The bike/pedestrian lanes are great. A bike entrance from Lake Washington Blvd. in Kirkland would be great for my community. The bike exit in Madison Park connecting to the bike path along the lake is wonderful!!!</li><li>2. I hope that you will take Montlake traffic flow into sincere consideration so that it does not bottleneck there.</li><li>3. In terms of funding, many people are supportive of a toll way. In Boston they don’t slow people down too much and it allows you to tax the people who use the road.</li><li>4. Fixed rail mass transit going from Seattle to U.W. to Bellevue to Microsoft and finally downtown Redmond is essential. I hope you will definitely include Mass Transit in phase I.</li></ol>
38	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Not good – too worried about problems if a N-S tube under the Montlake Cut would be devastating. Frankly, it would solve a lot of traffic problems!</li><li>2. 100,000 today cross the lake only 20,000 more by construction. NOT A GOOD VALUE.</li><li>3. Only decrease the Hamlin—Shelby community which suffers now.</li><li>4. Go elsewhere for a new toll facility; probably N. of SR 520 will solve many problems. Also, put Eastlake traffic on a non-I-5 route.</li></ol>
39	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. –</li><li>2. –</li><li>3. –</li><li>4. I live on Boyer Ave. E. I believe the present configuration on 520 between Montlake and I-5 should remain as it is. John Stevens.</li></ol>